



# TEC Breakout Discussion on Future Direction for TEC Participant Worksheets

January 29-30, 2002  
New Orleans, LA  
55 Participants

*\*The number appearing in brackets refer to the number of participants with the same comment.*

1. On a scale of 1 (lowest) to 10 (highest), how would you rate TEC's effectiveness relative to other comparable organizations? Average score = 7.51
2. The TEC mission is to "serve as a mechanism to provide continuing and improved coordination between appropriate DOE elements, other levels of government, and outside organizations having a responsibility for DOE transportation activities." Is TEC's mission largely complete? Why or why not?

Yes (6)	No (39)
-Lacks overall implementation of missions, especially coordination with tribal and local government	-DOE's transportation plans are dynamic (7) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• new routes, materials, modes continue to be added</li> <li>• new issues (e.g. security, funding, PR)</li> </ul>
	-Law enforcement needs to be involved (2)
	-Process is evolving with feedback from DOE Executive Management, the DOE mission and changing programs
	-TEC has an obligation to stakeholders and the public to continue with TEC because of their transportation plans
	-Need a forum for communication, training, and planning
	-TEC's mission is not complete until all sites are cleaned up
	-Need continuing and improved communication and coordination
	-Still many DOE shipments not involved in TEC
	-With budget cuts-transportation issues are more important
	-Not complete until SNF shipments are routine
	-Need to draw in new players
	-Hazmat will be an issue for a long time
	-Need to continue because Yucca may need a forum similar to TEC
	-Need help for high level waste campaigns
	-Problems resolved quicker and more effectively with this forum

**3. What benefits, if any, are currently being derived from the TEC process? Are there benefits for specific DOE programs? Are there benefits for participating non-DOE organizations? Please be specific.**

**-Benefits to stakeholders:**

- Provides a forum for stakeholders, DOE, and contractors to understand and work through issues (18)
- Coordination and training is incorporated into stakeholder experiences (2)
- Facilitates communication and decision making among stakeholders (2)
- Provides awareness and detailed knowledge of DOE programs
- Ability to report group positions and opinions to TEC
- Ability to obtain shipping information

**-Benefits to DOE:**

- Web site, matrices, MERRTT (4)
- Raised awareness and understanding on programs, issues, and transportation operations
- Better DOE coordination is evident over time
- DOE programs benefit from input, knowledge, and perspectives of various stakeholders
- Keeping these lines of communication open is the key to resolving transportation and packaging issues before they impact mission goals and/or project schedules
- Idea/issue resolution instead of 50 different issues
- Training avoids duplication of effort and cost and provides consistent training materials

**-Benefits to specific programs/groups:**

- Transportation protocols are an example of states needs/expectations being met (4)
- WIPP is a good example of a program that benefited from TEC
- First responder training program
- Instructional materials-improvements in design, development, and delivery
- Products from topic groups (i.e.-Routing Report)
- Training materials for EMS, Fire, Police, and others

**4. Are there current or emerging issues upon which TEC should become more focused? Please identify and state relevance to DOE transportation mission.**

<p><b>-Security Issues (21):</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Terrorism (5)</li> <li>• Form security topic group</li> <li>• Homeland security and Indian Tribal government</li> <li>• May best be discussed via Transportation Security Administration, DOE's security agency, and other State/Federal agencies</li> </ul>
<p><b>-DOE and TEC Issues (17):</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Yucca Mountain-will be the biggest challenge yet (7)</li> <li>• 180c Funding (2)</li> <li>• Monitor Idaho Settlement agreement</li> <li>• Formulized TEC process-new mission, goals, and objectives</li> <li>• Legal and political consequences of DOE if key issues are not resolved</li> <li>• State funding mechanism</li> <li>• DOE needs to be more responsive to protecting public health and safety</li> <li>• Development of matrix to gauge TEC's effectiveness at meeting member concerns and DOE expectations</li> <li>• Educating DOE's line managers about their reliance on the products and services provided by transportation professionals in DOE in conjunction with the counterparts in State, regional, and Tribal government</li> <li>• NRC Memo/Letter and reactive approach</li> </ul>
<p><b>-Shipment/Transportation Issues (11):</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SNF shipments (2)</li> <li>• Routing (2)</li> <li>• Private shipments (What have they done? How has it worked?)</li> <li>• Waste movement-high level and low level</li> <li>• Winter shipments and bad travel conditions</li> <li>• Highway Carriers</li> <li>• Improved processes for transportation planning</li> <li>• DOE needs PSM under control</li> <li>• Changes to DOE protocols-the public needs detailed and persuasive arguments</li> </ul>
<p><b>-Tribal/Local government Issues (7):</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Local government and Tribal notification of shipments (2)</li> <li>• Tribal jurisdiction</li> <li>• Ready for involvement from tribal nations</li> <li>• Work with local governments-provide consistent, up-to-date info, resources, etc.</li> <li>• TEC should examine the need for direct interaction with local governments adjacent to DOE facilities</li> </ul>
<p><b>-Emergency Response Issues (6):</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Develop materials/instructions for emergency response personnel (3)</li> <li>• Support of rural communities to meet emergency response needs</li> <li>• Funding of added escort and emergency relief programs</li> </ul>
<p><b>-Rail Issues (5):</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Route selection (1)</li> <li>• Rail shipment protocols</li> <li>• Encourage the marriage of rail and truck for shipments</li> </ul>

**5. How might the TEC process and focus change if TEC were held once a year? If meetings were not held at all? Could TEC function effectively, for instance, through Topic Group conference calls only? Please state preference and reasons why.**

<b>2 Meetings (22)</b>	<b>At Least 1 Meeting (12)</b>	<b>1 Meeting (10)</b>	<b>Not at All (0)</b>
<b><i>General Comments:</i></b>	<b><i>General Comments:</i></b>	<b><i>Proposed alternatives:</i></b>	
<p>-Two meetings a year are necessary because...</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Conference calls will not work; need face-to-face time <b>(18)</b></li> <li>• Topic groups need two meetings per year <b>(2)</b></li> <li>• One meeting per year would not be a good working session</li> <li>• Two meetings support open and honest dialogue</li> <li>• Products need to get out in a timely manner</li> <li>• DOE's shipping requirements are dynamic</li> </ul>	<p>-Need at least one meeting a year because...</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It will help facilitate information exchange and networking <b>(2)</b></li> <li>• Need face-to-face interaction</li> </ul>	<p>-One meeting a year would work if...</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Use Internet discussion tools, websites, emails, video conference <b>(6)</b></li> <li>• There were region/section meetings throughout the year <b>(4)</b></li> <li>• Topic groups met routinely</li> <li>• The meeting was longer</li> <li>• Incorporate TEC topics into State/regional meetings</li> </ul>	
<b><i>Negatives for Changing TEC Biannual Meetings</i></b>			
<p>-TEC would become inefficient <b>(5)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Less networking</li> <li>• Less ability to create consensus</li> <li>• Less information dissemination</li> <li>• Progress would slow</li> </ul> <p>-Would have to be almost entirely devoted to updates from the past year <b>(4)</b></p> <p>-Video conferences can be unreliable <b>(3)</b></p> <p>-Would miss other states/campaigns and "sharing" of "best practices"</p> <p>-Will lose all the progress that has been made over the past ten years</p> <p>-Gives a clear statement that DOE does not care about the State, Tribal and local issues</p> <p>-DOE would face legal action and political consequences if TEC did not exist</p>			

**6. Are there other DOE-sponsored groups with which you interact where the same issues are discussed at TEC? Which ones? If TEC were to be replaced, would the other groups' approach require modification? How?**

<b>Yes/Possibly (16)</b>	<b>No (18)</b>
-Regional groups-the difference is committee correspondence vs. formal comments on draft paper (3)	-Regional groups- only focus on regional issues, do not contain same audience mix
-CSG-MW High Level Radioactive Waste Transportation Committee	-SSEB-would need to combine with STGWG Meetings and National Governors Association meetings
-Combine STGWG with TEC (3)	-STGWG-sometimes will discuss transportation
-WGA Technical Advisory Group for WIPP Transport could incorporate TEC items on the agenda (2)	-WGA WIPP Technical Advisory Group-meets some requirements for western states, but do not provide interactions with remaining states and regions or with other DOE shipping programs
-National Governors' Association	-CSG-MW
-National Association of Attorneys General	-CRCPD-sometimes holds minor transportation discussions
-EMAB Transportation Committee	-Citizen's Advisory Board and Environmental Restoration meetings
-Cross Country Transportation Working Group	-National Highway Traffic Safety Administration
-FRR SNF at Savannah River Site	-U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
-Possibly ECA Peer Exchange Program (2)	-Federal Railroad Administration
	-U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
	-None that offer the same comprehensive issue coverage (2)

Acronyms:

CRCPD-Conference of Radiation Control Program Directors  
 CSG-MW-Council of State Governments-Midwestern  
 ECA-Energy Communities Alliance  
 EMAB-U.S. DOE Environmental Management Advisory Board  
 FRR SNF-Foreign Research Reactor Spent Nuclear Fuel  
 STGWG-State and Tribal Government Working Group  
 WGA-Western Governors' Association

**7. Are there logistical considerations (meeting size, information dissemination, etc.) that could help TEC accomplish its mission more effectively and efficiently?**

<p><b>-Logistical comments:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Should meet in Denver again-also consider Boise, St. Paul, Omaha, Austin, Phoenix</li> <li>• Meetings in DC may allow key DOE staffers more opportunity to attend</li> <li>• Meeting should not be longer than two full days</li> <li>• Need one working group meeting per year and one more general and informative meeting per year</li> <li>• Use less expensive meeting locations-more centralized, military/federal facilities</li> <li>• Meeting needs to be longer</li> </ul>
<p><b>-Topic Group comments:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Smaller, focused subgroups would make faster and more efficient progress (2)</li> <li>• Use of topic groups to address specific issues is a good way to ensure the size of deliberating bodies does not grow to the point of becoming unproductive</li> <li>• Need a forum to discuss DOE's expectations/needs from topic groups and establish stakeholder concerns from a process perspective</li> <li>• Meetings have been super-topic groups have set goals, recapped, and moved on</li> <li>• Topic groups have been very effective</li> </ul>
<p><b>-Information dissemination/communication:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To keep stakeholders engaged between meetings: use website links (DOE, NTP), Yahoo Group Discussions, email, ECA list-serve, Midwest Council of State Governments Newsletter (10)</li> <li>• Distribute materials sooner to participants</li> <li>• Use worksheets to focus each discussion</li> <li>• Use email for updates to save presentation time</li> <li>• Use newsletters/bulletins for information exchange</li> <li>• Keep large group discussion to a minimum</li> </ul>
<p><b>-Organization/Involvement comments:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• RW needs to take a bigger role in leading the meetings (2), or have a State/Tribal/county official be a co-lead</li> <li>• Would like to see a non-DOE co-chair and more involvement by non-DOE participants in planning meetings</li> <li>• Needs Senior Executive Transportation Forum-like mechanism that will allow input to DOE senior management</li> <li>• Would like to see more coordination with other DOE offices on informational products</li> <li>• Include other responder organizations, HUD, EPA</li> <li>• DOE needs to make a commitment to TEC at a higher level-someone at a position similar to Dave Huizenga needs to be an active participant</li> <li>• Several groups seem to be members, but never come-AASHTO, NARUC, &amp; NCSTS-perhaps they should be funded for travel so they can come</li> </ul>

## **Additional Comments:**

### **-Various TEC comments:**

- Consider if the mission is still mostly to cater to State, local, & Tribal jurisdictions (2)
- TEC should re-evaluate its mission based on the diverse groups represented in TEC; a re-statement of mission that represents these groups is needed
- If TEC was eliminated it would be necessary very quickly to provide another group/ organization to take up the slack
- If TEC disappears there would be a need to have all DOE programs attend all regional meetings
- Succession planning needs to be in place to accommodate the large number of retirements of transportation professionals in DOE and stakeholder organizations will experience over the next 5-8 years
- Need a new security mission statement
- Breaking 2 large TEC meetings into smaller meetings increases the fragmentation of the group
- DOE could save money if they piggy-backed TEC meetings with other DOE meetings
- DOE and TEC should note the lessons learned and take advantage of the WIPP program

### **-TEC Compliments:**

- TEC is the key to DOE moving radioactive waste
- Keep up the effort!
- DOE should take advantage of groups like TEC that support EM's cleanup program
- Biggest advantage is the discussion and diversity